DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 691 HE 002 095

AUTHOR	Dispenzieri, Angelo; Giniger, Seymour
TITLE	Student Expectations and Experiences as Predictors of College Performance.
INSTITUTION	American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, February, 1971
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Performance, College Students, *Community Colleges, Educationally Disadvantaged, *Expectation, *Higher Education, Prediction, *Student Attitudes, Student Experience
IDENTIFIERS	*City University of New York

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires measuring college expectation and experiences were administered to special program students, those below the academic level of the City of New York Community Colleges' regular matriculants, and to regular students. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine how the prediction of academic success was related to students' expectations and experiences as college freshmen. Eight expectations and experience clusters were derived by factor analysis and served as predictors of first semester GPA and credits earned, and first year GPA and credit earned in stepwise multiple regression analyses. Demographic characteristics such as high school average and diploma track, college attended, ethnicity, sex, and student population served as control variables. Realistic expectations of academic demands, insight into personal abilities, and readiness to work hard were positively related to performance. This paper also makes recommendations for utilization of the findings by guidance counselors and educational administrators. (Author/AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED049691

STUDENT EXPECTATIONS AND EXPERIENCES AS PREDICTORS OF COLLEGE PERFORMANCE

Angelo Dispenzieri and Seymour Giniger

Baruch College of The City University of New York

Each year increasing numbers of high school graduates are taking advantage of expanded opportunities for post-secondary education. Every student enters college with expectations about his educational future: some expectations concerning success and failure in courses, some concerning plans for social or intellectual activities, and others concerning survival in a maze of academic demands. Once involved in the college environment, students experience varying amounts of fulfillment of their expectations. The degree of satisfaction or disappointment with college may, in large measure, be due to the reality, accuracy, and usefulness of one's expectations.

To explore the phenomenology of college attendance--how students perceive, feel, and react to the college environment--a program of research was begun with two major goals: first, the description of expectations and experiences of entering college freshmen; second, the prediction of academic success and failure in relation to these expectations and experiences. A report on the first objective has been presented elsewhere. (Dispenzieri and Giniger, 1969). The present paper will focus on the second

HE 002 095

objective, the prediction of success and failure in college.

Research on the prediction of success as a function of expectations has been conducted with several different populations. Weitz (1956) found that insurance agents who, prior to hiring, were given a booklet describing their future job duties survived on the job longer than those agents not given the booklet. Youngberg (1963) replicated Weitz's findings and also found that agents given booklets describing their jobs were more satisfied than agents not given booklets. Both researchers felt that the realistic job expectations imparted to the agents accounted for successful adjustment.

Katzell (1968) found low but statistically significant negative correlations between withdrawal from school and confirmation of expectations among student nurses; fewer expectations of satisfaction were fulfilled for dropouts than for survivors.

Safer (1965a, 1965b)measured the expectations of an incoming freshman class of a large metropolitan university and correlated scores in her expectation scale with first semester grade point averages. The questionnaire stressed the student's expectations of his own behavior, and she found significant correlations between many of the scale items and academic achievement.

Method

Questionnaires. The present research program has proceeded primarily by employing two original instruments--the Expectations and the Experiences questionnaires.

In selecting items for inclusion in the experimental forms, the guiding principle was that the questionnaires were to inquire about any activities, stimuli, and environmental characteristics which might be relevant to performance in college and about which students might have expectations before entering and experiences after entering school. The viewpoint of the questionnaires is phenomenological: the respondent describes and evaluates from the standpoint of a participant in the college environment.

The research instruments were designed to allow students to describe their expectations at a relatively concrete level, specifying those activities they thought they and other students would engage in, those activities teachers and administrators were expected to perform, the resources students expected to use, as well as the kinds of stimulation they expected to receive from the college environment. The questionnaires thus circumvented the problem of translating psychological needs into policy decisions by allowing students to express their needs in terms of physical and social reality.

In the Expectations questionnaire, all items began with the phrase "I expect to find..." or an equivalent phrase denoting interest in expectations. Responses to most questions were on five-point Likert-type scales. The second instrument inquired about the students' first semester experiences. The Experiences questionnaire was parallel to the Expectations questionnaire, except that all items began with the phrase "I found..."

When administered at several colleges, the questionnaires can assist in discovering differential educational needs among institutions. Further, the research instruments could be used to compare groups of students, such as regular matriculants and students in special programs for the educationally disadvantaged.

Special Program Students. One of the earliest and largest programs for special students in this country was the College Discovery Program. The College Discovery Program was designed to provide higher education for socially disadvantaged students of intellectual promise whose high school scholastic averages, aptitude test scores and personal finances precluded admission under regular procedures to baccalaureate programs of The City University of New York. The goal of the program was to have students complete their first two years of college work at a community college and then to transfer to a senior college to complete their baccalaureate requirements.

The students selected for the program were "near-misses." Their high school averages fell just below the average required for college admission and they had not passed the college entrance examination. However, they had completed at least 12 academic units, including one year in science and one year in mathematics. They were a highly selected population, nominated by guidance counselors, teachers and principals, and ranked on the basis of motivation and potential ability.

All College Discovery students were required to complete the research instruments.

Regular Matriculants. A sample of regular matriculants in the baccalaureate-transfer programs of the community colleges of The City University of New York were selected for testing on a random basis.

Procedure. Prior to the start of the Fall, 1966 semester, the Expectations questionnaire was administered to entering freshmen in the College Discovery Program and a comparison group of regularly matriculated freshmen at five community colleges of The City University of New York (Bronx, Queensborough, Manhattan, Kingsborough, and New York City). Toward the end of the first semester, the Experiences questionnaires were mailed to all members of the College Discovery class and the comparison group, and over 80 percent of the questionnaires were returned.

There were 149 items in the College Discovery form and 121 items in the regular student form. Only those items common to both groups were retained for the analyses. The remaining 100 items were factor analyzed in order to yield more parsimonious dimensions. Eight centroids were extracted, and they were subjected to Varimax rotation, yielding eight factors. Only those items with loadings of .25 or higher were retained for each factor. Internal consistency reliabilities (Coefficient Alpha) were determined for the groups of items corresponding to the factor-analytically derived clusters. The reliability coefficients of the clusters ranged from .86 to .58.

The mnemonic labels of the eight clusters and their reliabilities are presented in Table 1. They encompass the following areas: student preparedness, non-academic activities, progressive teaching, dedicated instructors, adequate facilities, social interaction, good student traits, and student activities.

As the next step in the analyses, the item loadings of each cluster were weighted to form modified factor scores, so that each subject had two sets of scores for each of the eight clusters--one was a set of Expectations scores and the other was a set of Experiences scores.

Finally, a number of subjects were removed from further analyses--those who had prior college experience, were more than

twenty years old, and were members of the following ethnic groups: Other Spanish-speaking (i.e., Cuban, Dominican, etc.), Foreign-born black (i.e., Jamaican, Haitian, etc.), Foreign-born white (i.e., Italian, German, etc.), and Asian (i.e., Chinese). It has been found that the ethnic groups listed above have particular acculturation and language problems and come from family backgrounds other than those of the three major ethnic groups included in the study: the USA-born blacks, Puerto Ricans (USA- or PR-born), and USA-born whites.

Predictor Variables. Each Expectations and Experiences cluster was used as a unique and independent predictor of college performance in a series of multiple regression analyses. There were eight separate regression equations for the Expectations clusters and eight separate equations for the Experiences clusters. In the regression analyses, each Expectations score was partialled out of its parallel Experiences score, so that the Experiences scores provided a measure of residual gain.

Criterion Variables. The college performance criteria were: first semester grade point average (GPA), first semester credits earned (completed with a passing grade), first year cumulative GPA, and first year cumulative credits earned. GPA was derived from a grading scheme whereby each letter grade was equated to a numerical grade value as follows: A = 4.00, B = 3.00, C = 2.00, D = 1.00 and F = 0.00.

Control Variables. Several demographic variables were introduced into the prediction equations prior to adding each Expectations or Experiences cluster and, thus, their effects were partialled out of the Expectations and Experiences scores. The control variables were forced into the multiple regression equations in a fixed stepwise sequence as follows: high school diploma track, high school average, community college, ethnic group, sex, and condition (special student or regular matriculant).

High school average was the only quantifiable variable in the set. The nominal or qualitative variables were added to the regression equations by using a dummy variable coding scheme recommended by Cohen (1969), where 1 is assigned to the categorical variable of interest and 0 is assigned to all others, as shown below:

High school diploma track:

Academic, Commercial and Technical (1)

vs General and Vocational (0)

Community college:

Bronx (1) vs Queensborough, Manhattan, Kingsborough and New York City (0)

Queensborough (1) vs All Others (0)

Manhattan (1) vs All Others (0)

Kingsborough (1) vs All Others (0)

Ethnicity:

Black (1) vs Puerto Rican and White (0)

Puerto Rican (1) vs All Others (0)

Sex:

Male (1) vs Female (0)

Condition:

Special Student (1) vs Regular Matriculant (0)

Statistical Analyses. The data were adapted to the Biomedical 03R computer program (Multiple Regression with Case Combinations) utilizing the IBM 360-40 facilities at the Baruch College Computer Center. After all the demographic control variables had been included, each Expectations cluster was added to a separate regression equation so that it was possible to determine its unique contribution to prediction. A parallel operation was performed with the eight Experiences clusters. However, each Experiences cluster was always preceded by its matching Expectations cluster acting as a co-variate.

The performance measures of first semester GPA and first semester credits earned were regressed onto demographic characteristics and Expectations clusters for a sample of 545 subjects. Because of losses due to first semester attrition, the regression equations for first year criteria were based on a sample of 481 subjects.

Only those subjects who completed both an Expectations and an Experiences Questionnaire were included in the Experiences analyses. Thus, the sample utilized for the Experiences equations was reduced to 461 subjects for the first semester criteria and 419 subjects for the first year criteria.

Results

Demographic Characteristics. Table 2 presents the increments in multiple correlation squared (R^2) and partial correlations with criteria for all demographic variables. R^2 increment is the proportion of criterion variance accounted for by the predictor. The partial correlations with criteria were computed for each demographic characteristic with all other descriptive variables held constant.

The authors adopted a stringent criterion for determining significance. In order for an R^2 increment of a single predictor variable to be considered meaningful, it had to account for at least 1.0 percent of the variance in the criterion and reach the 1% level of statistical significance.

The first variable to enter the regression equations was high school diploma track. The increment in R^2 ranged from 3.1% to 10.4%, reaching the .001 level of significance for all four performance criteria. The data indicate that students in the

academic, commercial or technical diploma tracks achieved a better performance than students in the general or vocational tracks. Diploma track showed a stronger relationship to first semester credits passed and first year cumulative credits passed, with partial correlations reaching .21 and .22, respectively. The strong relationship shown with credits earned may be an artifact of diploma type. Since students with general or vocational diplomas are usually deficient in high school academic units, their college advisors would have recommended a reduced credit load together with non-credit or remedial courses to make up their high school deficiencies. Since general and vocational diploma students took fewer credit courses, they also earned fewer credits. On the average, general and vocational track students had completed three fewer college credits than the academic-commercial-technical group after the first semester, and five fewer credits at the end of the first year. Nevertheless, there remains a strong relationship of diploma track to grades for those credits that were attempted.

As each succeeding variable is added to the regression equations, it acts as a co-variate for the variables that follow. Thus, with diploma track held constant, we can now consider the contributions of high school average. High school average accounted for the largest proportion of variance in the criteria, ranging from 12.2% and 15.4% for first semester credits earned and first

year cumulative credits earned, to 21.7% and 23.6% for first semester GPA and first year cumulative GPA. All R^2 increments were significant at the .001 level. The partial correlations with criteria ranged from .22 to .29. High school average showed the strongest relationship to grade point average, its performance counterpart on the college level. Zero-order correlations for first semester and first year GPA were .48 and .52, respectively.

Although students with lower high school averages tended to take less college credits and, thus, earn less credits, the relationship was not always that clear because credit assignments depended upon the community college policies with regard to normal courseload. For example, students at one college were required to take a high credit load regardless of academic performance in high school.

With diploma track and high school average partialled out, only Community College B showed a significant relationship to all four criteria, accounting for 1.1% to 2.4% of the criterion variance. School B had lower GPAs and fewer credits completed than School E, the community college "reference group". It should be noted that School E had liberal grading practices, while School B imposed reduced credit loads and intensive remediation, where necessary, and maintained high academic standards. Further, School D showed a significant increment in R^2 for first year

cumulative credits earned (1.3%, $p<.01$); their students completed more credits than those in School E. Community College D required that all students, including those in special programs, maintain a high credit courseload.

With the preceding descriptive variables held constant, ethnicity was entered at this point and made a highly significant contribution to the prediction of the criterion measures. The black group showed increments in R^2 ranging from 1.5% to 2.1%, reaching the .001 level of significance for first semester GPA, and first year cumulative GPA and credits earned. The Puerto Rican group showed highly significant increments in R^2 on all four criteria, ranging from 1.7% to 2.3%. Both blacks and Puerto Ricans were lower on all performance measures than the white population which served as a reference group. It should be mentioned that most of the special program students were black and Puerto Rican while the great majority of the regular matriculants were white.

Sex did not add significantly to the prediction of the criteria. There were no substantive differences between males and females on any of the measures.

With all the major descriptive variables held constant, that is, after partialling out the effects of diploma track, high school average, community college, ethnicity and sex, the variable which differentiated special students and regular matriculants still made

a significant contribution to the prediction of three criteria. Condition accounted for 2.5% and 1.5% of the variance in first semester GPA and first year cumulative GPA, both at the .001 significance level. In addition, condition explained 1.4% of the variance in first year cumulative credits earned ($p<.01$). On all three measures, special program students did not perform as well as the regular matriculants.

In summary, the demographic characteristics accounted for 33.9% of the total variance in first semester GPA and 27.4% of the variance in first semester credits completed. Further, the descriptive variables explained 36.9% of the variance in first year cumulative GPA and 35.6% of the variance in first year cumulative credits completed.

Student Expectations. We have explored the contributions of the traditional predictors of college performance and found that even after controlling for academic preparation in high school, college attended, and personal characteristics such as ethnicity and sex, there remains a residual difference between special program students and regular matriculants. With condition held constant, we will now investigate the contributions of Expectations as non-intellective correlates of college success for students in general.

Table 3 presents percent increments in R^2 and partial correlations with criteria for each Expectations cluster acting as a unique predictor of first semester and first year performance. The table includes only those clusters adding significant criterion variance after having partialled out the effects of demographic characteristics.

Only Cluster VII which was labelled "Good student traits in handling academic demands of college" met the criteria for inclusion: it accounted for at least 1.0% of the criterion variance and reached or exceeded the .01 significance level.

Cluster VII explained 2.4% ($p<.001$) of the variance in first semester GPA and 1.4% ($p<.01$) of the variance in first semester credits earned. The partial correlations with criteria were .19 and .14, respectively. Further, the increment in R^2 was 2.1% ($p<.001$) for first year cumulative GPA and 1.8% ($p<.001$) for first year cumulative credits earned; partial correlations with criteria reached .18 and .17, respectively.

Cluster VII contains seven items which relate to the students' anticipations of academic demands such as assignments over long holidays, diligence and preparation required for exams, reading textbooks for courses, taking notes on lectures and discussions, spending time on study and homework, and worrying about exams. Students who entered college with realistic expectations of the

sacrifices and personal investment in time and effort necessary to succeed, performed better, in items of grades and coursework completed, than those whose images of college were not congruent with the typical demands of work, study and scholarship.

Student Experiences. College experiences were measured near the end of the first semester, prior to final examinations and assignment of grades. Each Experiences cluster entered the regression equations after partialling out the effects of demographic characteristics and the subjects' earlier responses to the parallel Expectations cluster. By controlling for each subject's initial scores on the Expectations clusters, we were holding constant scale position on Expectations and actually dealing with residual gain scores.

Table 4 shows that significant effects were found for Clusters I, IV and VII. Cluster I was labelled "Student preparedness for difficult academic requirements". The items in the cluster measured how prepared students felt they had been in reading, writing, mathematics and study skills; how often instructors gave unannounced tests, more outside readings than textbook readings, and lecture material over and above textbook material; how often instructors checked assignments weekly; students' use of old tests and notes from previous students; perceived student interest in ideas and intellectual problems, and perceived competition in class.

Cluster I accounted for 2.2% ($p<.001$) of the variance in first semester GPA and 1.4% ($p<.01$) of the variance in first semester credits earned. R^2 increments in first year cumulative GPA and cumulative credits earned were 1.7% ($p<.001$) and 1.1% ($p<.01$), respectively. The partial correlations with all four criteria were negative, ranging from -.13 to -.19.

Thus, the greater the perception of having been well-prepared for the difficult academic requirements during the first semester, the worse was the college performance. It should be noted, however, that the students showed a nearly universal decrease in their self-reports of the level of their academic preparation and the perceived difficulty of the college requirements (Dispenzieri and Giniger, 1969). In contrast to their Expectations, most students found that they were not as well-prepared and the college requirements were not as difficult as they had anticipated. In light of this finding, the relationship between student preparedness for difficult academic requirements and college performance can be restated as follows: those students who felt <u>less</u> unprepared and perceived the requirement to have been <u>more</u> demanding relative to the other members of their class registered a significantly poorer performance than those who perceived themselves to have been relatively <u>more</u> unprepared and the requirements to have been <u>less</u> demanding. The cluster appears to measure how realistic and insightful the students' perceptions

were with regard to recognizing the actual level of difficulty of academic requirements and their deficiencies in those qualities which are necessary for achieving college success.

The second Experiences cluster which made significant contributions to R^2 was Cluster IV, labelled "Dedicated college instructors". It consisted of 12 items concerned with the extent to which instructors were interested in their courses, could get their lectures across, took a personal interest in their students, were available outside of class, were more interesting than high school instructors, took class attendance, and covered material not found in the text. The cluster accounted for 2.9% ($p<.001$) of the variance in first semester GPA and 2.2% ($p<.001$) of the variance in first year cumulative GPA; the partial correlations with criteria were .22 and .19, respectively. R^2 increments for the other criteria were at a somewhat lower level: 1.5% ($p<.01$) for first semester credits completed and 1.3% ($p<.01$) for first year cumulative credits completed; partial correlations were .15 and .14, respectively.

It appears that the greater the perception of instructor dedication, the better was the student performance. However, we must take into consideration the fact that the students' awareness of how they were performing during the first semester may have colored their perceptions of the dedication and ability of their

instructors. The students who were doing relatively well might have attributed some of their success to their instructors' efforts, while those students who were performing poorly might have rationalized their poor performance and blamed their own inadequacies on their instructors. Thus, the causal sequence of the findings could be revised as follows: the better the student's performance, especially with respect to grades, the greater his perception of instructor dedication.

The final Experiences variable included in Table 4 was Cluster VII, "Good student traits in handling the academic demands of college". Cluster VII added significantly to the prediction of all four criteria, over and above the variance already accounted for by the students' Expectations. The increments in R^2 were 1.2% ($p<.01$) for first semester GPA and 1.1% ($p<.01$) for first semester credits earned; the partial correlations were .14 and .13, respectively. Cluster VII accounted for a somewhat greater proportion of the variance in the first year performance criteria: R^2 increments for GPA and credits earned were 1.7% ($p<.001$) and 2.1% ($p<.001$), respectively; the partial correlations were .17 and .19. The more that students were required to work on assignments over long holidays and the more they applied themselves in handling their demanding college work, the better was their performance.

Discussion

High school average and diploma track were the strongest predictors of college performance. However, the correlations were based upon the combined populations of special program students and regular matriculants. It should be recalled that the special students were below the academic level of the community college regular matriculants who, in most instances, did not possess the high school averages and academic units required for entrance into one of the senior colleges of the City University. The mean high school average for special program students was 74 while the mean for regular matriculants was 80. If the condition variable had been partialled out of the regression equations prior to the inclusion of high school average as a predictor, the correlations with the criteria would have been reduced because of the loss of between-group variance. For more clear-cut results, it would have been preferable to run separate analyses for special program students and regular matriculants in order to elicit the unique contributions of the predictors within each group.

Although high school average may be one of the best predictors of college success, the elimination of academic requirements via an open admissions policy will introduce enormous error variance that will reduce its effectiveness. Further, with the influx of students with "modified" or watered-down high school courses, the potential for prediction will be further reduced. The extreme

variance in the range and quality of the measures will certainly rule out the usefulness of traditional academic predictors.

The residual differences between the special students and regular matriculants which were present after adjusting for all other descriptive variables may be due to an enduring educational disability in the special students stemming from a multiplicity of factors, such as poor home and community environment, weak academic background, and financial deprivation. The remedial efforts of the compensatory program for the special students may not have been sufficient or appropriate enough for this population. Perhaps much more should have been done earlier in their educational careers if current efforts were to be successful. Julian Stanley (1970) has dealt with these issues and provided an excellent review of the problems involved in college programs for educationally disadvantaged students.

The Expectations-Experiences measures indicated that students who were prepared to work hard in college performed well. Further, those students who perceived themselves to be academically less prepared than they had anticipated and who perceived their instructors to be dedicated and able, worked harder in applying themselves to their college assignments and performed well. It appears that those clusters which most related to the nature of the college demands and measured the student's insight into

his own deficiencies were most strongly related to college success.

The results suggest that guidance counselors both in high school and college have a critical role in presenting a more accurate picture of college life--with special reference to the academic demands made upon the student, if successful performance is to be achieved.

It is our hope that the information based upon the expectations and experiences of college students would be used by educational administrators to identify students who, on the basis of the present findings, are particularly prone to failure, and remedial, counseling and other supportive services could be mobilized swiftly to prevent them from dropping out.

Finally, as more and more non-traditional students enter colleges, the measures could be utilized to ascertain the students' perceptions of the college environment and their self-perceptions in relationship to college. Aspects of their beliefs which have been shown to be dysfunctional could be corrected on this basis.

REFERENCES

Cohen, J. Multiple Regression as a general data-analytic system. Psychological Bulletin, 70, 6, 421-443.

Dispenzieri, A. & Giniger, S. A comparison of the expectations and experiences of special program students and regular matriculants in the community colleges of the City University of New York. New York: City University Research and Evaluation Unit, March 13, 1969.

Katzell, M.E. Expectations and dropout in schools of nursing. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52 (2), 154-157.

Safer, S.A. An investigation into the content of incoming Freshman students' expectancies about the college experience. (Doctoral dissertation, The American University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1965. No. 65-9943.

Stanley, J.C. Predicting college success of educationally disadvantaged students. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, September, 1970.

Weitz, J. Job expectancy and survival. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 1956, 40 (4), 245-247.

Youngberg, C.F. An experiemental study of "job satisfaction" and turnover in relation to job expectations and self expectations. (Doctoral dissertation, New York University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1963. No. 64-6516.

TABLE 1

Internal Consistency Reliabilities of
Expectations-Experiences Clusters

Cluster	Mnemonic Label	Coefficient Alpha
I	Student Preparedness for Difficult Academic Requirements	.86
II	Influence of Student Body on Non-Academic College Activities	.78
III	Progressive Teaching Practices	.66
IV	Dedicated College Instructors	.77
V	Adequacy of College Facilities	.79
VI	Student Emphasis on Social Interaction	.60
VII	Good Student Traits in Handling Academic Demands of College	.67
VIII	Participation in Student Activities and Influence on Academic Matters	.58

TABLE 2

Percent Increment in R^2 and Partial Correlation with First Semester and First Year Criteria for Each Demographic Characteristic Forced into the Multiple Regression Equations in a Fixed Stepwise Sequence

	Criterion							
	First Semester (N=545)				First Year (N=481)			
	GPA		Credits		Cum. GPA		Cum. Credit	
Predictor	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part r
Diploma Track	3.1***	.05	8.8***	.21	4.9***	.09	10.4***	.22
H.S. Average	21.7***	.25	12.2***	.22	23.6***	.29	15.4***	.22
Comm. College	2.3*	-	3.2*	-	1.9*	-	4.0**	-
School A	0.3	-.15	0.0	-.06	0.3	-.15	0.1	-.05
School B	1.9***	-.22	2.4***	-.18	1.1**	-.20	2.4***	-.16
School C	0.0	-.05	0.5*	-.05	0.5*	-.10	0.2	.01
School D	0.1	-.10	0.3	.03	0.0	-.06	1.3**	.08
Ethnicity	4.1***	-	2.5**	-	4.2***	-	3.8***	-
Black	1.8***	-.12	0.8*	-.10	2.1***	-.16	1.5***	-.15
Puerto Rican	2.3***	-.05	1.7***	-.08	2.1***	-.08	2.3***	-.09
Sex	0.3	-.06	0.1	-.04	0.6*	-.09	0.7*	-.10
Condition	2.5***	-.18	0.7*	-.09	1.5***	-.15	1.4**	-.13
Total R^2	33.9		27.4		36.9		35.6	

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

TABLE 3

Percent Increment in R^2 and Partial Correlation with Criterion for Each Expectations Cluster Adding Significant Variance as a Unique Predictor of First Semester and First Year Performance After Partialing Out the Effects of Demographic Characteristics

	Criterion							
	First Semester (N=545)				First Year (N=481)			
	GPA		Credits		Cum. GPA		Cum. Credits	
Expectations Cluster	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r
I Student Preparedness								
II Non-Academic Activities								
III Progressive Teaching								
IV Dedicated Instructors								
V Adequate Facilities								
VI Social Interaction								
VII Good Student Traits	2.4***	.19	1.4**	.14	2.1***	.18	1.8***	.17
VIII Student Activities								

** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

TABLE 4

Percent Increment in R^2 and Partial Correlation with Criterion for Each Experiences Cluster Adding Significant Variance as a Unique Predictor of First Semester and First Year Performance After Partialing Out the Effects of Demographic Characteristics and Each Expectations Cluster

	Criterion							
	First Semester (N=461)				First Year (N=419)			
	GPA		Credits		Cum. GPA		Cum. Credits	
Experiences Cluster	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r	R^2 Incr.	Part. r
I Student Preparedness	2.2***	-.19	1.4**	-.14	1.7***	-.16	1.1**	-.13
II Non-Academic Activities								
III Progressive Teaching								
IV Dedicated Instructors	2.9***	.22	1.3**	.15	2.2***	.19	1.3**	.14
V Adequate Facilities								
VI Social Interaction								
VII Good Student Traits	1.2**	.14	1.1**	.13	1.7***	.17	2.1***	.19
VIII Student Activities								

** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$